

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murao et al., U.S. Pat No. 6,696,790 in view of Sasaki et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,811,161. Murao does not teach all the limitations of claim 1. More specifically Murao does not teach a metal plate having a lead fitting hole. The Examiner cited reference number 7 as being a lead fitting hole. Referring to Fig. 3 and to column 3, lines 16–18 of Murao, the specification identifies reference number 7 as being through holes in the stem insulator 6 and not lead fitting holes in the metal plate. Thus, Murao does not teach a metal plate having lead fitting holes. Therefore, Murao does not teach all the limitations of claim 1.

Sasaki does not teach all the limitations of claim 1. More specifically Sasaki does not teach a stop edge that fits to the flat surface of the terminal to prevent the turning of the external terminal. The Examiner stated that reference number 50 is a stop edge that fits to a flat surface to prevent turning of the terminal. Referring to Figs. 1 or 8 and column 1, lines 38–47 of Sasaki, Sasaki discloses that reference number 50 is an electrode connector that fits to the flat edge of the electrode 36 and the conductors 46 are fixed to the connector by soldering. Thus, in Sasaki the conductors are prevented from turning by soldering the conductors to the connector 50 and not by a providing a stop edge. Therefore, Sasaki does not teach all the limitations of claim 1.

The Examiner objected to claim 2 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and

Appln. No. 10/749,288
Amdt. Dated August 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 24, 2005

any intervening claims. Claim 2 has been amended to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and thus is in condition for allowance.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36345.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Michael W. Garvey – Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 10, 2005